UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,659	09/07/2006	Fiona Campbell	007193-19 US	2462
	7590 10/14/200 JUM LAW FIRM, P. C	EXAMINER		
685 BRIGGS STREET			SOROUSH, ALI	
	PO BOX 929 ERIE, CO 80516		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/14/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Occurrence	10/567,659	CAMPBELL ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ALI SOROUSH	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>03 Au</i>	igust 2009					
	action is non-final.					
<i>i</i> —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-12,37-41,43-50,52-57,59 and 60</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,6-12,37-41,43-50,52-57,59 and 60</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	<u>_</u>					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
- apor rotor, main bato						

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/03/2009 has been entered.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 12, and 37 are currently amended and claims 5, 13-36, 42, 51, and 58 are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 are currently pending examination for patentability.

Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous Office Action are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set of rejections and/or objections presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,659 Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Applicant Claims
- 2. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 3. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue; and resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 1. The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casswall et al. (Bovine Anti-Helicobacter pylori Antibodies for Oral Immunotherapy, Published 2002) in view of Burggraber et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0180381 A1, Published 09/25/2003) and as evidenced by Dial et al. (Antibiotic Properties of Bovine Lactoferrin on Helicobacter pylori, Published 1998) is maintained.

Applicant Claims

Applicant claims method of inhibiting bacterial colonization of mucous epithelium, reducing bacterial infection of mucous epithelium, reducing damage to mucous epithelium associated with bacterial infection, and method for treating a disease or condition associated with bacterial infection of mucous epithelium by administering a composition comprising a mucloytic agent and a milk product. Applicant further claims the aforementioned composition.

Determination of the Scope and Content of the Prior Art (MPEP §2141.01)

Casswall et al. teach, "An anti-H. pylori bovine colostral hyperimmune immunoglobulin preparation (BIC) was generated and its efficacy was tested in different in vitro experiments ..." (See abstract). "Milk or colostrum from cows immunized with different antigens has previously been shown to be an effective and safe source of orally administered antibodies for both prophylaxis and therapy ... Hence, we produced a bovine immunoglobulin colostral preparation (BIC), which was used in therapeutic experiments in a H. pylori mouse model." (See page 1380, column 2, Lines 11-19 and page 1381, column 1, Lines 1-2). "The ability of the BIC to block the binding of H. pylori to gastric tissue in situ was compared with other bovine colostrum Ig preparations." (See page 1381, column 1, Lines 9-13). "The BIC preparation was then compared with a control preparation from non-immunized cows for its inhibition of binding of H. pylori to human gastric mucosa in situ. Almost 90% of blocking was observed when 0.1 mg/mL of the BIC was preincubated with H. pylori before incubation with human gastric mucosa tissue sections. BIC (1mg/mL) completely blocked the binding." (See page 1382, column 2, Lines 39-47). Caswell et al. further teach, "Much interest is currently focused on Helicobacter pylori infection and its association with development of gastritis, peptic ulcers and gastric malignancies in humans." (See page 1380, column 1, Lines 1-4). Caswell et al. conclude that "Bovine colostral antibodies against H. pylori can be generated in high titres, inhibit binding in vitro and can eradicate or reduce the number of bacteria in infected mice." (See abstract).

Dial et al. teach that bovine colostrum contains lactoferrin which has antibiotic properties against H. pylori. (See title and page 2754, column 2, Lines 10-14).

Application/Control Number: 10/567,659 Page 5

Art Unit: 1616

Ascertainment of the Difference Between Scope the Prior Art and the Claims (MPEP §2141.012)

The therapeutic composition taught by Casswall et al. lacks a teaching wherein the composition comprises acetylcysteine as the mucolytic agent. This deficiency is cured by the teachings of Bruggraber et al.

Bruggraber et al. teach, "Cobalt salts have been found to be particularly effective against H. pylori and may therefore be used to treat gastrointestinal infection with this bacteria ... Treatment with the cobalt salts may be carried out at the same time as conventional treatment with an antibiotic and/or proton pump inhibitor." (See abstract). "The cobalt ions may be used together with one or more agents which facilitate targeting together with one or more agents which facilitate targeting to the mucous layer. For example, the cobalt salt may be used together with agents selected from the group consisting of ... mucolytic agents (such as acetylcysteine, guaiphensin or ammonium citrate) ..." (See paragraph 0035). Bruggraber et al. further teach that one common conventional treatment used on H. pylori infection is complex triple therapies based on lansoprazole, amoxicillin, and metronidazole. (See paragraph 0019).

Finding of Prima Facie Obviousness Rational and Motivation (MPEP §2142-2143)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add the bovine colostral hyperimmune immunoglobulin

preparation taught by Casswall et al. to the treatment composition taught by Bruggraber at al., as suggested by Bruggraber et al., and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Bruggraber et al. teach that the treatment with cobalt may be carried out at the same time as conventional treatment. Casswall et al. teach that BIC has the ability to inhibit binding of H. pylori to gastric mucosa. Therefore, the combined compositions have the additive effect of treating gastrointestinal infections.

The examiner notes that Dial et al. teach that colostrum has lactoferrin.

Therefore, it is implicit to the BIC that it also contains an amount of lactoferrin.

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Applicant's Argument

Applicant argues that in view of the instant amendments none of the cited references teach each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found not to be persuasive. Casswall et al. teach application of colustrum from cows immunized with antigens against H. pylori to

Art Unit: 1616

human gastric mucosa, resulting in the inhibition of bacterial colonization. Dial et al. and Hemling teach that cow colustrum has both lactoferrin and iodine. Burggraber et al. teach that the mucolytic agent N-acetylcysteine is useful in treating H. pylori infections. Therefore, each and every element of the instant claim is taught by Casswall et al. For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-12, 37-41, 43-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is maintained.

Page 7

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Soroush whose telephone number is (571) 272-9925. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30am to 5:00pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on (571) 272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Application/Control Number: 10/567,659 Page 8

Art Unit: 1616

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ali Soroush Patent Examiner Art Unit: 1616

/Johann R. Richter/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616